



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

## Edinburgh Research Explorer

### Sigma portfolio and Bubble City

**Citation for published version:**

Bonet Miro, A 2016, '*Sigma portfolio and Bubble City*: Ludic sites for a mobile fun palace programme', *Architecture and Culture*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 137-161. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20507828.2015.1095051>

**Digital Object Identifier (DOI):**

[10.1080/20507828.2015.1095051](https://doi.org/10.1080/20507828.2015.1095051)

**Link:**

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

**Document Version:**

Peer reviewed version

**Published In:**

Architecture and Culture

**General rights**

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy**

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact [openaccess@ed.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@ed.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



## **SIGMA PORTFOLIO AND BUBBLE CITY: LUDIC SITES FOR A MOBILE FUN PALACE PROGRAMME.**

Ana Bonet Miro

Email: [Ana.Bonet@ed.ac.uk](mailto:Ana.Bonet@ed.ac.uk)

### **Abstract\_100**

This paper examines two ludic 'sites of information' -Alexander's Trocchi's *Sigma Portfolio* and Joan Littlewood's *Bubble City* pamphlet - within which Joan Littlewood's programme for a Fun Palace evolved in collaboration with a significant network of major personalities that included Cedric Price and Gordon Pask amongst others. On one hand it looks into the transference of qualities from content to format, and from site to idea; and on the other hand, it assesses the role of play in defining a 'metacategorical method' (in Trocchi's words ) in order to examine the broader cultural scope behind the Fun Palace.

### **Keywords:**

Fun Palace; Project Sigma; Bubble City; ludic; playground

### **Image captions:**

Fig. 1. Alexander Trocchi, 'The Moving Times' broadsheet, page 1, *Sigma Portfolio: A New Dimension in the Dissemination of Informations*, no. 1, 1964. Special Collections, National Library of Scotland. Reproduced with permission.

Fig.2. Cedric Price and Joan Littlewood, Fun Palace Promotional brochure, side 1, 1964. Black and red ink on reprographic copy paper, 36.2 x 59.8 cm. DR 1995:0188:001:023. Cedric Price fonds, Collection Centre Canadien d'Architecture / Canadian Centre for Architecture, Montreal. Reproduced with permission.

Fig. 3. Cedric Price and Joan Littlewood, Fun Palace: Promotional brochure, side 2, 1964. Black and red ink on reprographic copy paper, 36.2 x 59.8 cm. DR 1995:0188:001:023. Cedric Price fonds, Collection Centre Canadien d'Architecture / Canadian Centre for Architecture, Montreal. Reproduced with permission.

Fig. 4. Theatre Royal Stratford East in the 1970s. Courtesy of Theatre Royal Stratford East Archives Collection

Fig. 5. Joan Littlewood, *Bubble City* pamphlet, cover page, 1968. Courtesy of Theatre Royal Stratford East Archives Collection.

Fig. 6. Joan Littlewood, *Bubble City* pamphlet, page 4, 1968. Courtesy of Theatre Royal Stratford East Archives Collection

Fig. 7. Joan Littlewood, *Bubble City* pamphlet, page 19, 1968. Courtesy of Theatre Royal Stratford East Archives Collection

## **SIGMA PORTFOLIO AND BUBBLE CITY: LUDIC SITES OF INFORMATION FOR A MOBILE FUN PALACE PROGRAMME.**

### **INTRODUCTION**

The Fun Palace was a complex cultural programme<sup>1</sup> that emerged out of the London scene of the 1960s as an interdisciplinary collaboration initiated by the radical theatre producer Joan Littlewood and architect Cedric Price, which gathered together major personalities of the time such as the cyberneticist Gordon Pask, the polymath Richard Buckminster Fuller and the psychologist John Clark, amongst others. In it, advanced scientific systems thinking met with contemporary critical and anarchic artistic practice and the hedonist mood of freedom of the leisure society.

This 'interactive and adaptable, educational and cultural complex'<sup>2</sup> was animated by specific conceptions of play. Indeed, 'learning', together with 'pleasure and fun', are the main categories that would be used to classify the project in Price's 1984 monograph<sup>3</sup>. Pleasure and fun, according to Price, are a function of choice and of the 'calculated uncertainty' that the project made available for the user<sup>4</sup>. However, this idea of fun and pleasure does not exhaust the broader concept of play that was embedded in the Fun Palace, for play, in Littlewood's and Price's vision, is driven by a critical intentionality. It is this essential mimetic quality of the Fun Palace Project that I will refer to as 'ludic'. According to Roger Caillois, 'mimicry' is the illusory display of fantasy and simulacra. And the role of its representational effects in modern societies – which are governed by measure, effort and skill – is to provide a mirror image through which the serious performance of society can be questioned. The health of society depends precisely on the availability of mimetic situations through which alternative possibilities can be critically rehearsed<sup>5</sup>.

The Fun Palace was a mobile programme. Born as a 'university of the streets'<sup>6</sup> in the early 1960s, it struggled to find a site in the institutional map of London, so by the end of the decade had evolved into a set of educative and ludic activities linked to the construction of temporary playgrounds in the open spaces of Stratford East in London. The broader scope of the programme was about the construction of situations where playful exchange could activate audiences. And the role of architecture in it was to be defined and questioned, as Price recalls from Littlewood's brief: 'you tell me whether architecture can help'<sup>7</sup>. According to Price, 'she wanted to see some situation which might have been a social situation, an economic situation, a political situation, where the ability for random humour and beastliness could result in a productive exchange which was not measurable, but just fun when it happened'<sup>8</sup>. From the 'Fun Palace Project' to the 'Stratford Fair', the whole programme was governed by the Fun Palace Trust, and took on different expressive forms along the decade. The 'Fun Palace Project' evolved in parallel as the 'Major Fun Palace', the most ambitious expression of the programme in architectural terms, and the test-bed 'Camden Pilot Project', which released the social and educational content of the idea in urban public spaces<sup>9</sup>. But simultaneously to these, the less influential 'Donmar Development' - a combination of a rehearsal room for experimental theatre, and a late night club for discussion and entertainment<sup>10</sup> - was as well supported by the Trust. Two more undertakings followed these, and although the Trust was not involved in them, they were closely related to the Fun Palace idea: Littlewood's 'Living Theatre' summer course at Hammamet, Tunisia, and Price's 'Feasibility Study for an Information Hive' in the Oxford Corner House, London.

The Fun Palace programme was materialized in an evolving set of representations distributed across different publications during the 1960s. Considered here as 'sites of information', these published representations succeeded in building a broad range of cultural 'situations' – borrowing from a Situationist glossary of terms. These were not only media, but critically engaged networks actively operating to overcome institutional frames in search of a utopian freedom. Each of these 'sites', not only recorded the transformation of the Fun Palace programme, but also fundamentally enhanced and informed its meaning in specific ways. It is *within* this diversity of media that the mobile Fun Palace could expand beyond the object-like condition that it had acquired in architectural discourse into a more critical event of wider cultural significance.

This representational dissemination of the Fun Palace programme resulted in divergent outcomes. While official institutional culture succeeded in ignoring such an unwieldy proposal, the idea positively evolved within alternative sites. By 1964 the Fun Palace Project had gained momentum, and a colossal 'laboratory of pleasure'<sup>11</sup> was depicted on the vacant site of Mill Meads<sup>12</sup>, within the publication *A Lea Valley Regional Park* produced by the Civic Trust<sup>13</sup>. In the same year, the eleventh issue of the *Sigma Portfolio*, the editorial project of the British writer and Situationist member Alexander Trocchi, referred to the idea under the title 'Joan Littlewood Presents'<sup>14</sup>. However, by 1969 the ambitious Fun Palace Project had disappeared from the Civic Trust's official *Report on the Development of the Regional Park with Plan of Proposals*<sup>15</sup>. Instead, a little pamphlet entitled *Bubble City*<sup>16</sup>, was to be the vehicle through which Littlewood's idea of the playground evolved.

This paper examines the ludic quality of two of these alternative 'sites of information', the Fun Palace broadsheet within Trocchi's *Sigma Portfolio* and the pamphlet *Bubble City*, and relates these to broader cultural theories and events. On one hand the paper looks into the transference from content to format, and site to idea; and on the other, it assesses the role of the ludic in defining a 'metacategorical method' to unveil the broader cultural scope behind the Fun Palace's 'metallic laughter' (to borrow Italo Calvino's description of Brecht's work)<sup>17</sup>.

## **'JOAN LITTLEWOOD PRESENTS ....' WITHIN THE *SIGMA PORTFOLIO***

The connection between the Fun Palace idea and Trocchi's Project Sigma has not been sufficiently attended to in architectural scholarship. Either the Fun Palace has been related to other Situationist undertakings such as the utopian New Babylon<sup>18</sup>, or - when explicitly addressed - the link with the British Situationism of Alex Trocchi has been claimed to be 'accidental', based on affinities that 'grew from common ideological and artistic roots'<sup>19</sup>. However, the Fun Palace was a major reference for Trocchi's Project Sigma, and its influence is specifically detectable across the diverse set of folders bound as the *Sigma Portfolio*: Folder number 11 titled 'Joan Littlewood Presents...', contains a reproduction of the Fun Palace broadsheet, which is defined as 'an early impression of an idea (...) for a consciously constructed environment'; Joan Littlewood and Cedric Price were part of Trocchi's array of 'pool cosmonauts' - we find their names within the list of 'public relations' of the Project Sigma, in folder no. 17; In folder no. 5 titled 'General Information', Trocchi writes about the 'metacategorical method' of 'Joan Littlewood's experiments', a method that is shared by the Sigma network; And finally, Trocchi explicitly refers to his proposed university as 'hav(ing) much in common with 'Joan Littlewood's "leisuredrome" (if she will forgive my coining a word)'<sup>20</sup>. If the Fun Palace Project found

a place in the *Sigma Portfolio*, then, an analysis of this complex site of information might inform our understanding of both, the Sigma and Fun Palace ideas.

The *Sigma Portfolio* was an editorial project of international scope initiated in London in 1964 by Alexander Trocchi, a British poet and affiliate of the Situationists. 'Sigma', he explained, was 'merely a word, a tactical symbol, a dialectical instrument'<sup>21</sup> to refer to a 'cultural attitude (...) assumed by a vast number of men and women who have never heard of the sigma project'<sup>22</sup>. Under the sign of this summative mathematical function, an anonymous, inclusive and invisible cultural revolt was anticipated. 'Modifying, correcting, polluting, deflecting, corrupting, eroding, outflanking'<sup>23</sup>, this underground tremor was progressively to transform the consciousness of a million minds. As part of the project, an action-university was to be among the first constructed situations for an invisible insurrection. Described as a 'vital laboratory for the creation (and evaluation) of conscious situations'<sup>24</sup>, Trocchi's proposal bears many resemblances to the anti-institutional approach to education of the Fun Palace programme. The ultimate aspiration in both the Project Sigma and the Fun Palace, was to stimulate personal and social growth as a major emancipatory force. And growth is, in both projects, a function of the quality of the conversation initiated. The *Sigma Portfolio* was a 'site of information' designed to evolve this conversation, and therefore, part of the realization of the Project Sigma itself. But, considering the inclusion of the Fun Palace in it, it can be seen as well as a partial realization of the latter.

At the beginning of the 1960s, Raymond Williams's cultural critique was precisely linking social growth to the quality of the conversation held within social institutions such as the media. Since society is a form of communication where experience is described and shared, media should go beyond the narrow frame defined by trade and power relations and offer opportunities for learning and growth as well. Only within public and democratic fora, can a free, independent and critical conversation evolve. However, in his diagnosis of the institutional panorama of British communications, the concentration of power and the drive to sell emerge as major impediments to growth. The resulting 'synthetic culture' - 'one which exploits indifference, lack of feeling, frustration and hatred' - could only be combatted through education for personal development and choice, under the proper institutional support<sup>25</sup>.

Sites such as the *Sigma Portfolio* could be seen - following Williams's argument - as those for learning and growth in themselves. Indeed, the design of the *Sigma Portfolio* enacts the resistance to this (in Williams' terms) 'synthetic' condition by providing what Trocchi describes as 'an entirely new dimension in publishing, through which the writer reaches his public immediately, outflanking the traditional trap of publishing-house policy'<sup>26</sup>. His public was an anonymous collective distributed across the globe, and therefore a mode of 'effective communication' was needed in order to reach it. *Sigma Portfolio* was cheaply produced in Trocchi's house at St Stephen's Gardens, London. Typed folio-sized papers, duplicated onto coloured sheets of foolscap and stapled, they were posted to several hundreds of people<sup>27</sup>. They reported 'sigmatic'<sup>28</sup> activity through a multi-format collection of tactical pamphlets which gave voice to manifestations of the international counter-culture. Included were letters and poems from 'Beat' contributors; manifestos such as 'The Invisible Insurrection' (*Sigma Portfolio* .no. 2) or 'Manifesto Situationiste: Sigma Edition' (*Sigma Portfolio* .no.18); personal essays such as 'Revolt: McClure' from the American poet Michael McClure (*Sigma Portfolio* .no. 21), or the 'The Present Situation' from the anti-psychiatrist R.D. Laing (*Sigma Portfolio* .no.6); as well as data related to the Project Sigma such as 'Public Relations' (*Sigma Portfolio* .no.17) or 'Subscription Form' (*Sigma Portfolio*.no. 12). Together with these, *Sigma Portfolio* incorporated two other formats. One was 'The Moving Times' (*Sigma Portfolio*.no.1), a title courtesy of the writer and Sigma contributor William Burroughs, whose format also echoed his use of cut-ups (Figure. 1). It aimed to bring together

world-wide contributions 'relevant to our moving times' in an A2 broadsheet format, a sort of 'poster-perversion' of the official newspaper. It was to be posted within the advertising space of the London Underground network, but also in certain alternative bookshops, coffee-shops and art galleries, 'wherever it can conveniently be exposed' as Trocchi affirms<sup>29</sup>. Indeed, due to its public nature, a certain 'subtlety of subversion' was essential<sup>30</sup>. The other format was 'Potlacht' (*Sigma Portfolio* no. 4), a folio-sized pamphlet which echoed the Lettrist publication of the same name. It initiated an interpersonal polemic, 'with all kinds of layers and laminations and possibilities for satire', and due to its private quality, there was 'no limit to what it could become'<sup>31</sup>.

The Fun Palace's broadsheet arrived in *Sigma Portfolio* no. 11 'hot from the writer's pan', in its spirit of direct communication<sup>32</sup>. The broadsheet had been produced for the Lea Valley Press Conference held on July 20, 1964, when the report entitled *A Lea Valley Regional Park* commissioned by the East London Boroughs to the Civic Trust was presented at a public event amidst dignitaries, including the Duke of Edinburgh and the local government minister. The broadsheet was designed to explain for the first time what the Fun Palace was in a direct way to such an official culture, while simultaneously, its multi-format design reached alternative contexts such as Sigma. The archival record 'pamphlets distributed to'<sup>33</sup>, dated the same day of the Press Conference, registers this ambivalent intent within the communications of the Fun Palace idea. A list of thirty-eight names represents the array of diverse actors and agencies involved in the distribution of the Fun Palace broadsheet: here representatives of London County Council (LCC), left-wing politicians and journalists share space with the main authors and collaborators, but also with a plural set of contributors such as the architectural critics Reyner Banham and Roy Landau, Theatre Workshop's actor Brian Murphy, and of course, Alex Trocchi. The distribution list of the broadsheet shows not only the expanded conversation stimulated by the Fun Palace programme at the time, but also more specifically the Fun Palace network in operation. If intensity of commitment is indicated by the number of broadsheets assigned to each name, Littlewood's principal role is defined by the 100 units that she received. Alex Trocchi appears to be a main agent, with '30 +36' broadsheets assigned<sup>34</sup>, which are over the sixty of Theatre Workshop member Brian Murphy, the thirty of Price's chief assistant Stephen Mullin, and the twenty-four of the Labour Party member Ian Mikardo. The rudimentary delivery methods rely on 'post' or 'hand', which Sigma had identified as 'effective communications', and evidence the close exchange, even touch, within the Fun Palace network. The 'confidential' label written in many textual records of the project, or warnings such as Price's 'no drawings of the (Fun Palace) project can be issued before August 1963'<sup>35</sup> inform further the thesis of a slow, unmediated and stealthy communication of the Fun Palace idea within the network. The Fun Palace broadsheet emerges here as an inchoate 'site of information' in itself, intertwined with Trocchi's *Sigma Portfolio*<sup>36</sup>. The shared interest in the stimulation of appetites for learning beyond formal structures would lead to later encounters, such as the Anti-University in London in 1968<sup>37</sup>. In it, the Sigma network was fully operating (amidst new voices such as Gustav Mezger's Auto-Destructive Art), and Price became involved as visiting faculty<sup>38</sup>, evidencing the sustained interaction and growth between Sigma and the Fun Palace networks.

What the broadsheet successfully represented was the major architectural realization of the Fun Palace idea, the 'Major Fun Palace'. It is worth analyzing here the ludic quality of the Fun Palace broadsheet as it relates to the broader context of the *Sigma Portfolio* to understand the 'metacategorical method' operating here. What is evident is a playful transfer from content to format, and ultimately to idea. Play, as the anthropologist Gregory Bateson explains, is a form of 'metacommunication'- or communication across different levels where denotative and connotative meanings are exchanged simultaneously- whose principal quality is paradox. Play, as happens with fantasy as well, is not an action, but a frame for those actions which really do not mean what they

appear to mean. Essentially, as Bateson claims, human communication needs paradoxes to evolve, and the role of play (and fantasy) is to provide the frame for this to happen<sup>39</sup>.

Like the *Sigma Portfolio*, the Fun Palace broadsheet (Figures. 2 and 3) is itself a multiple assemblage of information aimed at a plurality of audiences. A folded A2-sheet divides the space into different sections which are allocated to a playbill, a double page drawing, a narrative description of the experience, a programme of activities offered, and technical information regarding the current state of the Project's development as well as management procedures and credits. Such a multi-layout media matches an environment itself designed to be 'multilateral rather than comprehensive'<sup>40</sup>. In the first section, a playbill advertises the show: 'Joan Littlewood presents the / FIRST GIANT / SPACE MOBILE/ IN THE WORLD/ it moves in light / turns winter into / summer (...) toy (...) / EVERYBODY's / what is it?'<sup>41</sup>. This draws on the tradition of the fair and its 'carnavalesque laughter' – festive, universal and ambivalent, in Mikhail Bakhtin's terms<sup>42</sup> that lay at the core of the Fun Palace idea. The play element knits together the festive content and ludic intent of the experiment. On the one hand, the colossal mechanism is 'the first (...) in the world' to offer such superlative fantasy and accessible fun to everyone. On the other hand, it raises a sharp critique of the institutionalized world, a world for which fun is nothing more than a 'voluntary greed marketable commodity'<sup>43</sup>. On the reverse side of the broadsheet, a double-page diagrammatic 'cut-away view' draws the field of play. In it, the programmatic zones such as 'inflatable conference hall' or 'news panel' overlap onto the line drawing, as instructed by Littlewood<sup>44</sup>. This diagrammatic communication can only express rules of the game, whereas the play experience itself is communicated in a colourful narrative description that, in the lower strip of the page, accompanies the drawing. 'Choose what you want to do' is the essence of the fun-as-pleasure experience, according to Price<sup>45</sup>. An offer of 28 pleasures, such as 'Battles of flowers' or 'Genius Chat'<sup>46</sup>, leads on to what seems to be the summative phrase of the playbill: 'for your delight'. But the ludic critique is equally represented here: The fun experience continues to evolve underneath a large fading title in art-deco red capital letters, with the name 'Fun Palace'<sup>47</sup> covering the whole strip. We can read here how the ironic mood affects the whole experience inside this 'giant space mobile'. Play, both as pleasurable narrative and as critical mood, are the figure and ground map of the strip, and by extension, the quality of the whole environment which the Fun Palace aims to build. It is in this double sense of play which is a feature of many of Littlewood's theatrical productions, where we find precisely the 'metacategorical method' upon which Trocchi plans to outflank bureaucracies subtly to initiate their cultural revolt.

However, as with 'The Moving Times', the irony spread across the various messages included in the Fun Palace broadsheet had to be carefully pitched due to its public nature. The design had to bridge the gap between official and alternative audiences: As 'The Moving Times' had to be accepted on the advertising boards of the London Underground network, similarly, the Fun Palace had to satisfy the authorities overseeing the plans for Lea Valley Regional Park Development. Here a first 'sigmatic' quality of the Fun Palace programme emerges in the need to be audience inclusive. Inclusiveness is fostered through the multi-format communication strategy of the broadsheet, with its diverse set of sections on display. Inclusive is as well the space announced as 'everbody's (...) toy' in the playbill, designed to be highly accessible 'by train, bus, monorail, hovercraft, car, tube or foot'<sup>48</sup>. Similarly, the eclectic collection of texts gathered together in 'The Moving Times' and the varied formats within *Sigma Portfolio* demonstrate Trocchi's inclusive approach as clearly distinct from Guy Debord's exclusive Situationist vision<sup>49</sup>, and helps us to appreciate the position of the Fun Palace against the polarized field of Situationist polemics.

A second property of the Fun Palace programme that is closely linked to this inclusive ethic is the accessibility of the communication and the space itself. Both the Fun Palace broadsheet and the *Sigma*

*Portfolio* aimed at a direct communication between author and audience, one in which mediation could be minimized. As a media event, the Fun Palace broadsheet could overcome bureaucratic organization through the subscription and postage model of distribution within the Sigma network, or even be immediately handled within the Fun Palace network. As a designed space, an unmediated environment emerges within the lines written in the broadsheet. The narrative strip directly points at us with capital letters: 'YOU', while claiming that the project had 'no doors, foyers, queues or commissioners'<sup>50</sup>. It opens to us a democratic space embedded in the ideal of freedom where there is 'no obligation to buy'<sup>51</sup>. A subtle mediation is, however, present within the words describing the experience in the broadsheet: an 'artificial cloud will keep you cool or make rainbows for you'<sup>52</sup>. Indeed the idea of a cybernetic system underpins the design with the aim of indicating a means towards effective social emancipation.

Two cultural references come to mind when discussing accessibility as direct and non-mediated communication between authors and audiences. Immediacy is, via the Brechtian legacy, part of the claim for a critically-engaged authorial agency, for which authors become producers and argument activate thinking on the part of the audience about the relations of production that underpin daily experience<sup>53</sup>. Littlewood, Price and the Sigma network are operative writers, as these 'sites of information' are operative media in accordance with Walter Benjamin's discussion of Brecht's theatre. Alternatively, critical readings of the slow and tactile mode of operation of these 'sites of information' emerge drawing on Paul Virilio's theorizations on media. In his view, the militarized speed governing new media actually outpaces any resistant position, producing 'an immobile spectator of action, not a mobile participant'<sup>54</sup>. It has been argued that such an immediate communication within Sigma's 'site of information' becomes an important part of the way experience was actively shared<sup>55</sup>. If the highly technological appearance of the Fun Palace Project seems to imply an impersonal and machinic relay of information, it was - on the contrary - the slow and covert ways in which confidential information was stealthily handled and passed on that was crucial to the affective bonding together of the members of the network and the positive impact it maintained throughout the decade.

Mobility is the third sigmatic property that emerges from the broadsheet. The giant space mobile is actually inviting us to move with it, as with the similar claims of 'The Moving Times' in the *Portfolio*<sup>56</sup>. Movement is used as a metaphor for the stealthy self-transformation named 'learning' in the Fun Palace or '(r)evolt' in Sigma. As Trocchi affirms in his Invisible Insurrection manifesto 'we must reject the conventional fiction of "unchanging human nature". There is no such permanence anywhere. There is only becoming'<sup>57</sup>. In spatial terms, an environment designed to last no more than ten years<sup>58</sup> stands for the temporary nature of the design: 'it must last no longer than we need it'<sup>59</sup>. The condition of perpetual provisionality and contingency of the Fun Palace idea enacts Littlewood's own mobile condition, with her frequent changes of postal address as the internal memo 'JL Movements Autumn 1964' manifests<sup>60</sup>. In the broadsheet this is reinforced by the constant lack of a stable physical site for the palace's construction. A sort of feasibility study included in one of the sections, defines the 'ideal site', speculates about its location across the globe and lists four possibilities 'under investigation' in London. But, of course, many equals none. Instead, the materializations of the Fun Palace idea were to occur, in an ever-evolving state of flux, in the imprints it left in different hosting media such as the *Sigma Portfolio*<sup>61</sup>. In a sense, the multiple representations included in the Fun Palace broadsheet extend to the non-structured assemblage of the *Sigma Portfolio*, and testify to an irreducible plurality and mobility that resists any representational stabilization of the idea itself, considered here in its broader cultural scope.



## **BUBBLE CITY AND THE EVOLUTION OF THE PLAYGROUND IDEA**

The withdrawal of the Fun Palace Project from the Lea Valley Regional Plan in 1966 is a story carefully elaborated by Stanley Mathews<sup>62</sup>. It occurred, not surprisingly, soon after the publication in 1965 of the Labour Party's White Paper 'A Policy for the Arts: the First Steps'. Despite its well-received intentions to democratize the living arts and activate public participation in them, at the same time the proposal relied on the Arts Council for the implementation of its ambitious programme. In Cedric Price's view, such an 'extraordinarily conservative organization' (...) 'is scarcely the ideal medium of patronage to achieve the breakthrough to total enjoyment of the arts implied in the White Paper'<sup>63</sup>. The lack of institutional support, from the Arts Council as much as from the planning authorities, constituted a moment of crisis for the Fun Palace programme itself. But at the same time, this brought more opportunity to renew it in alternative formats. A letter of c. 1965 from Joan Littlewood to Mrs Peggy Jay, the Chairman of the Parks Committee of the recently-formed Greater London Council (GLC), sets out the wide-ranging educational scope of the programme, assuring its ongoing active condition through renewed contexts outside London, and Littlewood's determination to keep developing it:

'I have been occupied for the last 9 months 1. With starting a Fun Palace in Tunisia, 2. With making enough money to support the work for this experiment in London.(...)/The need for street corner education-toys, like the Fun Palace, is I think understood and I do not underestimate the virtue of English democracy but I am sad that old infra-mafia-movement which haunts bureaucracies should be holding up the chance of new systems of education starting here. /London should have been the first place and our brightest brains should be diverted to the problems of the future, while the old Jesuits deal so cleverly with the mess made of the past. / Of course, I have no intention of giving up the campaign here (...)'<sup>64</sup>.

From 1965 onward, the Fun Palace programme would inspire a wide range of experiences enhancing different assets according to the sensitivity of its leadership. The first opportunity available for a pilot Fun Palace, in Littlewood's view, took the form of a one-month training course on 'free, living and authentic theatre'<sup>65</sup> at the International Summer School, Le Centre Culturel in Hammamet, Tunisia. 'We've no place for a Pilot/ I wouldn't say no to Hammamet?(...)The Fun Palace is necessary anywhere'<sup>66</sup>. On his part, Cedric Price could test more closely the Fun Palace idea in his Feasibility Study for an Information Hive in the Oxford Corner House, London, between 1965 and 1966. However, according to the contract extended by the developers, 'your work with the Fun Palace trustees should be excluded from this undertaking'<sup>67</sup>. Despite the seriousness of this clause, an ironic and playful handwritten document by Joan Littlewood on Price's official paper, included in the same archival folder, situates her in the scene. Littlewood's non-official voice is addressed to 'Le Grand Anti-Arch', in what could be the record of a relaxed conversation with Price presumably some time in 1965<sup>68</sup>. Her blue handwritten musings, such as 'will people pay for entry or activities?' or her rants and raves about 'clubs must go' or 'oh, the lovely capitalists', are supported by black ink 'yep' in what seems to be Price's hand. A feeling of the mutual understanding achieved can be sensed, although each would lead the Fun Palace programme through divergent paths.

Under the name 'Stratford Fair', Joan Littlewood set to develop her 'university of the streets' as a range of coordinated, tactical and self-organized temporary playgrounds and fairs in the vacant sites near the Theatre Royal in Stratford East (Figure 4) from 1967 to 1975. Helped by a broad team of collaborators from her ensemble Theatre Workshop, Price's role was focussed on gaining planning permission on behalf of the governing Fun Palace Trust, a charitable body constituted in 1966. The overall aim remained the same - namely, to contest the idea of progress promoted by top-down

institutional structures of governance, and the ludic form was maintained. But the focus now became local, the quality performative, and the audience shifted more specifically to the youth of the Stratford community. Here, the Fun Palace programme moves to enhance continuous education for active citizenship through place-making and community building, and achieves a more active socio-political efficacy<sup>69</sup>.

A new 'site of information' captures this idea of playground in which the Fun Palace programme had been renewed. *Bubble City* is a small, concise and critical A5 pamphlet written by Joan Littlewood, designed by Oscar Tapper, and published by the Fun Palace Trust in 1968 (fig. 5). In line with the *Sigma Portfolio* and the Fun Palace broadsheet, the pamphlet collates a heterogeneous set of information. Voices which include opening quotes from *Archigram* and Max Born, pages from Littlewood's diary, inserts from the local newspaper *The Stratford Express* and excerpts from legislative texts mix with photographs of the debris surrounding Stratford East, child-like drawings of inflatables and ludic toys made by young designers and artists. These are accompanied by practical information on activist groups in East London and a questionnaire for volunteers.

But unlike to the fragmented *Portfolio*, Joan Littlewood's words are intertwined here within the structured nineteen-page pamphlet to develop a coherent and critical argument. In what reads like one of her theatre scripts, an overall critique of top-down urban renewal processes grows steadily and rhythmically through the sequence of dissonant scene-like pages. Accompanied by the silhouette of a boy, an opening question initiates Littlewood's enquiry about the educative role of the playground in the formation of the subjectivities of local young people: 'What will I be? Tinker, tailor, soldier, sailor, richman, spaceman, con-man, thief?'<sup>70</sup> Juxtaposed contradictory information follows in order to ironize the possibility of deriving a liveable environment from 'official' rules. For instance, excerpts from the Civic Amenities Act of 1967 about tree provision or prohibitions regarding the abandonment of junk, are confronted with real photographs of a 'tree-less area' or a 'dumped car' parked in the street (Figure 6). Such satire is a hallmark of Littlewood's productions: in her acclaimed *Oh! What a Lovely War* (1963) the dramatic data of the official war game, which is on display in the backstage, becomes enacted through the festive atmosphere of the music-hall performance, designed to present the ordinary soldier's view and life through popular war songs<sup>71</sup>.

Environmental deterioration is only one aspect of overall socio-cultural deprivation, in which education emerges as a major issue. On page nine of the pamphlet, a diagnosis of the negative effects upon children of a deficient educative service grows from data gathered between 1952 and 1968 referencing the UNESCO conference on illiteracy held in 1966 in Tunisia:

'1968-(...) low standards in education, a run-down environment, the break-up of old patterns of social relationship, leave children ill-equipped to face adult life; drifting from one menial job to another, bored and semi-illiterate, no outlet for their natural intelligence, no training in decision making, they burn up their energy in smash-ups, in stealing and outwitting the adults who mostly hate and fear them; and a nation's prosperity depends on the educational level of its citizens'<sup>72</sup>.

But beyond critique, *Bubble City* calls for action and draws a plan. 'A no-mans land' is presented in page three to stimulate action: 'what (...) to do'. The playground idea in the form of the 'Stratford Fair', is the new implementation of the Fun Palace programme. It retains the focus – evident in the Camden Pilot Project or the Major Fun Palace – on the educative potential of the open air and public spaces of London, although now in minor form through a sequence of local events. It addresses the community with the main purpose of engaging them in the urban re-generation process commencing in Stratford East: 'the young need to participate in living'. And now, her collective action-oriented strategy is not

any more a dream, but a reality, as the past tense of the verbs indicate: '1967- A team of local children helped to clear rubble and dumped rubbish from a site in Salway Road, Stratford'<sup>73</sup>. Although the ambitions are more restrained in this phase, the efficacy of such a guerrilla attitude has proved to be immediately practical: 'it's not a Royal Park / but a symbol / that their place will keep on growing'<sup>74</sup>. As Littlewood reports to the trustee Buckminster Fuller in March 1968:

'These efforts are small in relation to the ideas set down for the "Fun Palace" but the work of taking over strips of war-time debris and transforming them, to supply the needs which assert themselves, has proved immediately practical'<sup>75</sup>.

A 'mobile fair' -as Littlewood explains to Fuller - is among the plans for the immediate future, for which 'a team of designers' will provide 'piped learning', a 'brain-bank' and 'street corner education toy[s]'<sup>76</sup>. The toys include Bruce Lacey's inflatable structure 'Journey through the Human Body / Humanoid' (Figure 7), Michael Leonard's audiovisual tower and the 'inflatable fun structure' of Simon Conelly, Mike Davies, Jonny Devas and David Martin. Child-like drawings of the inflatables, next to a questionnaire titled 'so mark the team you fancy', give expression to the overall intent to recruit for action<sup>77</sup>. The mobile condition of the fair affirms the steady, if not increasing, provisionality and contingency of the Fun Palace programme, now far from the stable ten-year life span devised for its earlier realizations. This is intimated in the changeability of the inflatables designed: 'structures can be renewed, duplicated or improved and left where they are needed most'<sup>78</sup>; in the lack of a venue three months ahead of the event while 'many sites are being investigated'<sup>79</sup>; and in the fluctuating network of artists participating, with significant drop-outs like Peter Cook, but also with additions such as Bruce Lacey. At the same time, the increasing diversification and extension of the Fun Palace network evidences the growing efficacy of the communicative outputs of this evolving site.

The overarching educational purpose of the playground idea is orientated by a concept of personal growth as a function of engagement in the transformation of the environment through collective action. In such a conception of education, performance takes a major role. And the territorialization of the idea, both social and physical, is now part of a continuum that starts at the theatre's stage and unfolds onto the streets. Not only does action take place simultaneously 'in theatre' and 'on the pitch'<sup>80</sup> under the leadership of the art-director of the Theatre Workshop Robert Atkins, but actors and neighbours are collectively reconstituted for action through team-work. Theatre Royal Stratford East, now transformed into a "'Learn-and-Play" Club', becomes the catalyst for the educative activities within its surroundings<sup>81</sup>. 'At its best (theatre) is the great educator, keeping our language alive, giving us the music and poetry which seem to identify us and add some value to our brief journey'<sup>82</sup>. Its principal role, in Littlewood's vision, is defined through a description of 'the Posh Night' at Theatre Royal - providing a magic circle in which judgements about hopelessness of reality can be suspended and despair transformed:

'The day's troubles (...)re-enacted; the boys (...)identifying themselves with the "enemy". Then, as the evening wore on, fantasy would enter. Ambitions, hopes, dreams and fears would be acted out(...)/The energy of violence can be channelled into genius'<sup>83</sup>.

The *Bubble City* pamphlet is itself living theatre. Not only does it take the form of a script for what could be Joan Littlewood's latest satirical production, but also the transference of theatre resources into the street playgrounds is credited in the pamphlet through the dual role of Una Collins, the stage designer for *Oh! What a Lovely War* and author of the child-like drawings of the inflatables. Fundamentally 'Bubble' as a title, seems to be the master-image of Littlewood's idea of theatre based on growth through performance, according to the order in which questions are posed on pages thirteen and fourteen - 'what is theatre?', 'is it a bubble?', and the answer, 'it very nearly was'<sup>84</sup>. As

performance conquers the centre of Littlewood's renewed Fun Palace, it also permeates inside the lines of the *Bubble City* pamphlet. Again in the manner of William Burrough's cut-up technique, we see how the words themselves become ludic and metamorphic, themselves enacting the intended transformation: 'This very day, Funday 16<sup>th</sup> July, beginneth the Falway Road Fun Place (...)'<sup>85</sup>.

Looking back to the first representation of the Fun Palace programme within *Sigma Portfolio*, a final comment on the relation with the earlier proposals of inclusiveness, accessibility and mobility needs to be made. The *Bubble City* pamphlet does not share the 'subtlety of subversion' that accompanied 'The Moving Times' section. It does not function as a bridge between official and resistant positions, both located in any case in a cultured audience. Instead, *Bubble City* is made for the ordinary youth of Stratford East. So communication needs to be less polite and more accessible, since immediate action is a must. Accessibility is achieved here through the simple and concise quality of the critical pamphlet, its well-argued content, the intentionally unsophisticated but effective language and graphics used, with photographs of derelict surroundings followed by child-like drawings of inflatables, and the inserts of useful information when needed in the building of the overall critical argument. And lastly, with regard to mobility, the ever-growing provisionality and contingency of the idea is now manifested in the spontaneity and improvisation of the actions planned, now struggling to last merely a few days. *Bubble City's* fluctuating content depicts an uncertain future very much dependent on the activity it manages to generate in the community.

## CONCLUSIONS

The analysis of these two episodes in the evolution of the Fun Palace idea shows the direction of its development during the 1960s. The general movement was toward a progressive intensification of focus and specificity, and at the same time, a loosening of design in favour of spontaneity and finally activism. This emerges through the qualities of the sites, both in the physical territories defined and in the communicative strategies devised within the mediating 'sites of information'.

In spatial terms, the early representations of the Fun Palace included in the broadsheet show a democratic space *par excellence* – an 'everybody's' toy – yet one that is directed to a *generic* audience. It takes the form of a 'laboratory of pleasure', and in doing so it defines a model of space detached from any *specific* site. Indeed, the carefully *designed* palace proposes a *generic* infrastructure that can be accommodated across the globe. Simultaneously defined as architecture-free, theatre-free and education-free, the overall claim of the palace was about a *general* freedom from any institutional context. At the same time, the big interior perspective shows the spatial configuration of an instant in this ever-changing mechanism. However, its spontaneity is governed by an invisible cybernetic system which 'make(s) rainbows for you'. The audience is directly acknowledged in capital letters – 'YOU' – but the play takes place in a technological stage that is already prepared. Considered as a media event, the early Fun Palace found many specific sites, both official such as the Lea Valley Development plan reports, and alternative such as the *Sigma Portfolio*. The *public* character of the Fun Palace broadsheet is evidenced in the need to reach such a diverse audience. So, in line with 'The Moving Times' section of the *Sigma Portfolio*, a certain 'subtlety of subversion' was implemented in its design.

By the end of the 1960s, and under the name of 'Stratford Fair', the Fun Palace idea evolves into a more informal and site-specific activity of place-making and community building. The new territory is

now a continuum which starts at the theatre and unfolds in the 'as-found' neighbouring streets of Stratford East. The spatial model shifts into an event-model – self-organized and highly temporal playgrounds made by the local children. And the overall purpose becomes more focussed: education for active citizenship. In it, theatre plays a major role, and improvisation is now its rule. Meanwhile design and technology assist the overall performance, with the provision of inflatable toys when necessary. The *specificity* and *spontaneity* found across the pages of the little pamphlet *Bubble City* enhances the renewed Fun Palace idea. The audience and distribution is now localized in the ordinary community of Stratford East, so the upper-case 'YOU' of the broadsheet shifts to a lower-case 'us' in the pamphlet. Accessible and direct communication is devised to engage its young readers in action through a concise and coherent script-like pamphlet, which mixes visual and textual information of critical and practical intentionality. Contradictory information is not only juxtaposed to satirize the *specific* failures of 'official' culture in the neighbourhood, but also a play with words is located in the description of *specific* events- 'Funday 16<sup>th</sup> July'. Since no one 'makes rainbows for (...)us on the street, the desperate closing call for action: 'get your skates on!' unpacks the ever growing provisional condition of the Fun Palace programme.

## Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Professor Mark Dorrian for some important comments and suggestions made during the development of this article.

## Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> Joan Littlewood and Cedric Price conceived the Fun Palace as a comprehensive programme. It emerges, for instance, from her description of Donmar Development: 'it is essential that such a club is established in the near future as part of the preliminary Fun Palace programme' Joan Littlewood and Cedric Price, in 'Proposed Use of Donmar Rehearsal Rooms as Experimental Theatre & Late Night Meeting Place for Talk and Entertainment', c 1964, DR 1995:0212:060, Cedric Price Archive, Canadian Centre for Architecture (CCA)

<sup>2</sup> Cedric Price Archive, Collection Online, Canadian Centre for Architecture (CCA), 'Scope and Content, Descriptive Summary, File 46: Fun Palace Project, Series 2: Projects.', n.d.

<sup>3</sup> Cedric Price, *Cedric Price: The Square Book* (Chichester: Wiley-Academy, 1984).

<sup>4</sup> Cedric Price, *Autumn Always Gets Me Badly* (London: Architectural Association, 1989), 33' 55'', AA Photo Library.

<sup>5</sup> Roger Caillois, *Man, Play, and Games* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1962).

<sup>6</sup> Cedric Price and Joan Littlewood, 'The Fun Palace', *The Drama Review*, no. 3 (1968): 127.

<sup>7</sup> Stanley Mathews, *From Agit-Prop to Free Space : The Architecture of Cedric Price* (London: Black Dog Publ. Ltd., 2007), 66.

<sup>8</sup> Cedric Price, 'Chat', *Architectural Design* 41 (April 1971): 231–32.

<sup>9</sup> Cedric Price and Joan Littlewood, 'Fun Palace, Camden, London', *Architectural Design* 37 (November 1967): 522.

<sup>10</sup> Littlewood and Price, 'Proposed Use of Donmar Rehearsal Rooms as Experimental Theatre & Late Night Meeting Place for Talk and Entertainment' DR 1995:0212:060.

<sup>11</sup> Price and Littlewood, 'The Fun Palace'.

<sup>12</sup> Mill Meads, a vacant site located at the banks of the River Lea in Stratford, was part of the public initiative at the time to regenerate the derelict and polluted Lea Valley into a regional park.

<sup>13</sup> Civic Trust and England Lea Valley Regional Park, *A Lea Valley Regional Park, an Essay in the Use of Neglected Land for Recreation and Leisure*. (London: Civic Trust, 1964).

---

<sup>14</sup> Alexander Trocchi, *Sigma Portfolio: A New Dimension in the Dissemination of Informations [sic]* (London: Alexander Trocchi, 1964).

<sup>15</sup> Lee Valley Regional Park Authority, *Report on the Development of the Regional Park with Plan of Proposals* (Enfield: Lee Valley Regional Park Authority, 1969).

<sup>16</sup> Joan Littlewood, *Bubble City* (London: The Fun Palace Trust, 1968).

<sup>17</sup> In the obituary written in 1956, Italo Calvino praises Bertolt Brecht's Epic Theatre, in its 'scientific passion' together with his commitment to activate critical participation of the audience, in Italo Calvino and M Barengi, *Saggi: 1945-1985* (Milan: Mondadori, 1995), 1301. Indeed, Brecht defined his critically driven Epic Theatre as opposed to the prevailing dramatic theatre of his time as: 'narrative' (versus plot); 'turns the spectator into an observer'; but 'arouses his capacity for action'; 'forces him to take decisions(...)'; 'argument' (versus suggestion); 'reason' (versus feeling), in Bertolt Brecht, *Brecht on Theatre: The Development of an Aesthetic* (London: Methuen Drama, 1990), 37. The sustained influence of the Brechtian legacy on all Littlewood's undertakings, including the Fun Palace as well as her theatrical experiments, went back to her participation in Ewan MacColl's Theatre of Action in the 1930s, and consistently informed her productions onwards at Theatre Union and the later Theatre Workshop. Their manifestos explicitly address a critically driven approach to theatre, which dealt with real problems of its time and aimed to activate thinking in the working class audience. While Theatre Union's manifesto claims for a theatre which 'in facing up the problems of our time and by intensifying our efforts to get at the essence of reality, we are also attempting to solve our own theatrical problems both technical and ideological' (Mathews, *From Agit-Prop to Free Space: The Architecture of Cedric Price*, 54). Theatre Workshop's supports a 'not genteel, not poetical' theatre in which 'our critics and supporters were miners, cotton workers and steel workers who haven't much time for mere artistic experiment' (Joan Littlewood, 'Theatre Workshop. A British People's Theatre', n.d., 1, Theatre Royal Stratford East Archives Collection). The material for Littlewood's critical approach was scientific- based, as Littlewood's collaborator Murray Melvin claimed: 'Whenever you played with Joan there has to be a reason, and it was usually knowledge-based (...)a scientific reason'(Melvin, M., interview with the author, December 10, 2014). Trocchi shares this interest in Brecht's critical theatre, as he explicitly addresses 'his "distance-theory" of acting, a method calculated to inspire a more active and critical kind of participation' (Alexander Trocchi, 'Invisible Insurrection of a Million Minds', *Sigma Portfolio*, no. 2 (1964): 3).

<sup>18</sup> New Babylon or the Fun Palace are examples of the utopian content of megastructures according to Reyner Banham. Quoting the description of the former project by Constant as published in *Architectural Design* (June 1964), Banham suggests that 'you could insert the word Fun Palace in it without making any injustice either to this or to the Fun palace Project' (Reyner Banham, *Megastructures 1*, ARTNET Public (London, 1974), min. 48:35, Lecture Series, AA Photo Library). Instead, Simon Sadler point at the differences between both: the Fun Palace illustrate the 'detail and practicality of British experimental architecture' while New Babylon 'seem to lack that rigor' (Simon. Sadler, *The Situationist City*. (Cambridge, Mass; London: MIT, 1999), 133–134). However, in their studies there is not an explicit connection between the Fun Palace and Trocchi's *Sigma Portfolio*.

<sup>19</sup> Mathews, *From Agit-Prop to Free Space: The Architecture of Cedric Price*, 113–114.

<sup>20</sup> Alexander Trocchi, 'Sigma: A Tactical Blueprint', *Sigma Portfolio*, no. 3 (1964): 5.

<sup>21</sup> Alexander Trocchi, 'Project Sigma: Cultural Engineering', *Sigma Portfolio*, no. 22 (1964).

<sup>22</sup> Alexander Trocchi, 'Pool Cosmonaut', *Sigma Portfolio*, no. 37 (1964).

<sup>23</sup> Trocchi, 'Invisible Insurrection of a Million Minds', 2.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 6.

<sup>25</sup> Raymond Williams, *Communications* (London: Penguin, 1966).

<sup>26</sup> Alexander Trocchi, 'Subscription Form', *Sigma Portfolio*, no. 12 (1964).

<sup>27</sup> Andrew Murray Scott, *Alexander Trocchi: The Making of the Monster* (Edinburgh: Polygon, 1991), 126.

<sup>28</sup> Alexander Trocchi, 'Manifesto Situationiste: Sigma Edition', *Sigma Portfolio*, no. 18 (1964): 4.

<sup>29</sup> Alexander Trocchi, 'Letter to C. Price', July 1964, DR 1995:0188:525:002:003, Cedric Price Archive, CCA.

<sup>30</sup> Alexander Trocchi, 'Potlach', *Sigma Portfolio*, no. 4 (1964): 2.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 6.

<sup>32</sup> Trocchi, 'Subscription Form', 1.

<sup>33</sup> Joan Littlewood, 'Pamphlets Distributed to', c 1964, DR 1995:0188:525:002, Cedric Price Archive, CCA.

<sup>34</sup> In an updated version of the record 'pamphlets distributed to' 30 pamphlets are added to Trocchi, which shows the intensification of the collaboration between Sigma and Fun Palace networks (Joan Littlewood, 'Pamphlets Distributed to 19641205', December 5, 1964, DR 1995:0188:0525:003, Cedric Price Archive, CCA).

---

<sup>35</sup> Description of the Fun Palace Project as part of Price's proposal for the National Theatre and Opera House Competition. Cedric Price, 'Description of Relevant Work. Entertainment Centre Development, London, Sheet 8', 19 June 1963, DR 1995:0207:001:005, Cedric Price Archive, CCA.

<sup>36</sup>The intertwining of the Fun Palace and Sigma 'sites' goes beyond the publication of the broadsheet in *Sigma Portfolio* no. 11. In a meeting between Price and Trocchi plans for 'sigmatic Christmas Cards—some of which could contain F.P drawings of written information' are mentioned, as well as 'forms of further co-operation agreed'. Alexander Trocchi, 'Letter to C. Price', October 24, 1964, DR 1995:0188:525:002:003, Cedric Price Archive, CCA.

<sup>37</sup> Anti-University, as its manifesto claims, was a 'revolutionary experiment', which was 'founded in response to the intellectual bankruptcy and spiritual emptiness of the educational establishment' of the Western World. It offered a 'meeting ground for discussion (and) discovery 'to radical artists, activists and intellectuals in order to foster 'social integrity and commitment'. 'Catalogue of Second Quarter. Anti-University of London.', 1968, DR: 1995:0320, Cedric Price Archive, CCA.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid.

<sup>39</sup> Gregory Bateson, 'A Theory of Play and Fantasy', in *Steps to an Ecology of Mind: Collected Essays in Anthropology, Psychiatry, Evolution, and Epistemology* (Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press, 2000), 177–193.

<sup>40</sup> Price and Littlewood, 'Fun Palace, Camden, London', 522.

<sup>41</sup> Joan Littlewood and Cedric Price, 'Fun Palace Promotional Brochure', July 1964, DR 1995:0188:525:001:023, Cedric Price Archive, CCA.

<sup>42</sup> Bakhtin's thesis on 'carnavalesque laughter' would not reach English audiences until 1968. Michail Bakhtin, *Rabelais and His World* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2009), 12–13.

<sup>43</sup> Price, *Autumn Always Gets Me Badly*.

<sup>44</sup> Joan Littlewood and Cedric Price, 'Draft Section for the Fun Palace Promotional Brochure', c 1964, DR:1995:0188:525:001:004, Cedric Price Archive, CCA.

<sup>45</sup> Price, *Autumn Always Gets Me Badly*.

<sup>46</sup> Littlewood and Price, 'Fun Palace Promotional Brochure'.

<sup>47</sup> The name chosen: 'Fun Palace' is pregnant with mockery, as Cedric Price recalls: 'Surely, we thought with such a nonsensical, nauseatingly fey title, we could hide or hang any use on it we wished', activities which he had defined as 'disparate, free-choice, free-time voluntary'. Cedric Price, 'Cedric Price Talks at the AA', *AA Files*, no. 19, Spring (1990): 27–34.

<sup>48</sup> Littlewood and Price, 'Fun Palace Promotional Brochure'.

<sup>49</sup> Scott, *Alexander Trocchi*.

<sup>50</sup> Littlewood and Price, 'Fun Palace Promotional Brochure'.

<sup>51</sup> Joan Littlewood, 'Littlewood's Handwritten Draft of Fun Palace Promotional Literature, Page 3', c 1964, DR 1995:0188:525:001:005, Cedric Price Archive, CCA.

<sup>52</sup> Littlewood and Price, 'Fun Palace Promotional Brochure'.

<sup>53</sup> Walter Benjamin, *Understanding Brecht: Walter Benjamin* (London: New Left Books, 1977), 88.

<sup>54</sup> Sean Cubitt, 'Virilio and New Media', in *Paul Virilio: From Modernism to Hypermodernism and Beyond* (1 Oliver's Yard, 55 City Road, London EC1Y 1SP United Kingdom: SAGE Publications Ltd, 2000), 127–142, <http://knowledge.sagepub.com/view/paul-virilio/n7.xml>. Accessed May 2015.

<sup>55</sup> Michael Gardiner, *From Trocchi to Trainspotting. Scottish Critical Theory Since 1960* (Edinburgh University Press, 2006), <http://edinburgh.universitypressscholarship.com/view/10.3366/edinburgh/9780748622320.001.0001/upso-9780748622320> Accessed May 2015.

<sup>56</sup> Alexander Trocchi, 'The Moving Times', *Sigma Portfolio*, no. 1 (1964).

<sup>57</sup> Trocchi, 'Invisible Insurrection of a Million Minds', 1.

<sup>58</sup> Price and Littlewood, 'The Fun Palace', 130.

<sup>59</sup> Littlewood and Price, 'Fun Palace Promotional Brochure'.

<sup>60</sup> 'Internal Memo, JL Movements Autumn 1964', August 11, 1964, DR 1995:0188:525:002:003, Cedric Price Archive, CCA.

<sup>61</sup> Together with the broadsheet, a seemingly unfinished film produced by Mithras Films, London in 1964 was part of the promotional media designed to communicate the Fun Palace programme within an expanded audience. Shot in black and white on sixteen millimeter format, it consists of an intermittent documentary of scenes about everyday pleasures enjoyed by ordinary men, intertwined by clownery. In line with Littlewood's theatrical productions and the British Free Cinema of the 1950s, the low tech and improvised assemblage of

---

effective immediacy, reinforces the claim for freedom for the ordinary man. Joan Littlewood and Cedric Price, 'Fun Palace Film', c 1964, DR 2003:0006, Cedric Price Archive, CCA.

<sup>62</sup> Mathews, *From Agit-Prop to Free Space : The Architecture of Cedric Price*.

<sup>63</sup> Cedric Price, 'Observations on "A Policy for the Arts" Government White Paper', in *New Towns New Cities*, ed. Ellis Hillman, Essays in Local Government Enterprise (London: The Merlin Press, 1965), 173–74.

<sup>64</sup> Joan Littlewood, 'Letter to Mrs. Peggy Jay', n. d., Box 'The Fun Palace', Theatre Royal Stratford East Archives Collection.

<sup>65</sup> 'Littlewood, Rene Allio, Jan Kott, at Hammamet', *International Theatre Informations Internationales*, August 1965, 121, DR 1995 0225, Cedric Price Archive, CCA.

<sup>66</sup> Joan Littlewood, *Joan's Book: Joan Littlewood's Peculiar History as She Tells It* (London: Methuen, 1994), 727–728.

<sup>67</sup> J. Lyons & Co. Ltd., 'Letter to Cedric Price', October 14, 1965, 3, DR1995:0224:342:002, Cedric Price Archive, CCA.

<sup>68</sup> Joan Littlewood, 'Untitled Handwritten Document', n.d., DR 1995:0224:342:002, Cedric Price Archive, CCA.

<sup>69</sup> Nadine Holdsworth, *Joan Littlewood's Theatre* (Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 234.

<sup>70</sup> Littlewood, *Bubble City*, 2.

<sup>71</sup> John Elsom, *Post-War British Theatre* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1976), 114.

<sup>72</sup> Littlewood, *Bubble City*, 9.

<sup>73</sup> Ibid.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid.

<sup>75</sup> Joan Littlewood, 'Letter to Prof. R. Buckminster Fuller', March 25, 1968, DR 1995:0188:525:003, Cedric Price Archive, CCA.

<sup>76</sup> Littlewood, *Bubble City*, 17.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid., 19.

<sup>78</sup> Ibid.

<sup>79</sup> Littlewood, 'Letter to Prof. R. Buckminster Fuller'.

<sup>80</sup> Joan Littlewood, '1st Draft Programme of Fair on Salway Road. Bank Holiday, Monday 31st', n.d., Box 'The Fun Palace Trust, The Fun Palace- Minutes', Theatre Royal Stratford East Archives Collection.

<sup>81</sup> Littlewood, 'Letter to Dr. Connolly, (from Education Office, Stratford, London E15)', January 11, 1967, DR 1995: 0188:525:003, Cedric Price Archive, CCA.

<sup>82</sup> Joan Littlewood and Gerry Raffles, 'Uses for Land Awaiting Redevelopment, 1967-1975, around Theatre Royal Stratford, London E15', c 1975, 36–37, DR 1995:0188:525:001, Cedric Price Archive, CCA.

<sup>83</sup> Littlewood, *Bubble City*, 13.

<sup>84</sup> Ibid., 13–14.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid., 12.